arXiv:cond-mat/0306378v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 5 Aug 2003

Free expansion of lowest Landau level states of trapped atoms: a wavefunction microscope

N. Read[1] and N.R. Cooper[2]
[1] *Department of Physics, Yale University, P.O. Box 208120, New Haven, CT 06520-8120*
[2] *Theory of Condensed Matter Group, Cavendish Laboratory, Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0HE, United Kingdom.*

(June 13, 2003)

We show that for any lowest-Landau-level state of a trapped, rotating, interacting Bose gas, the particle distribution in coordinate space in a free expansion (time of flight) experiment is related to that in the trap at the time it is turned off by a simple rescaling and rotation. When the lowest-Landau-level approximation is valid, interactions can be neglected during the expansion, even when they play an essential role in the ground state when the trap is present. The correlations in the density in a single snapshot can be used to obtain information about the fluid, such as whether a transition to a quantum Hall state has occurred.

There has recently been interest in states of trapped atoms that are rotating near the critical frequency of a harmonic trap [1–9]. When the atoms are bosons, there is a vortex lattice at moderate rotation rates [2], but at high rotation rates quantum fluctuations are predicted to melt the lattice [5,8] and produce exotic highly-correlated many-body states that are related to those occurring for electrons in the quantum Hall effect [1,4–7]. A standard experimental technique is to turn off the trap potential suddenly, and then take a snapshot of the cloud of atoms after it has expanded to many times its original size (a free-expansion or time-of-flight experiment). A question that arises is what information can be extracted from such an image of a quantum Hall state. In this note, we point out that in a relevant regime, the density distribution in such a snapshot directly represents the density at the time of switch-off, but rescaled and rotated by 90° about the original rotation axis. This result is simpler than the results of previous work on the free expansion of a Bose condensate in the Gross-Pitaevskii or Thomas-Fermi regimes, that can describe a Bose condensate or vortex lattice. While in a few cases the length scales of the density distribution are simply scaled up by a factor, more generally the condensate function also evolves during expansion [10–13]. Usually, the form of the density distribution after a free expansion is not simply related to the initial density; rather, for noninteracting particles it is related to the momentum distribution. Although our result can be extracted from special cases of earlier analyses, the emphasis is different. We emphasize that the neglect of interactions during the free expansion is justified whenever all the bosons can be assumed to be in the lowest Landau level (LLL) just before the switch-off, even though interactions may be crucial in the highly-correlated ground state that exists before that time. Consequently, the result applies to any LLL many-body state, not only a Bose condensate. (These points were also made briefly in Ref. [7] for the density expectation value.) We also suggest how a snapshot of the particles after a free expansion can be used to obtain information about the nature of the original state, as it constitutes a microscope that enlarges the real-space image of the state.

We begin by explaining the classical version of the problem, which will make the later quantum many-body treatment easily understandable. We take particles of mass M in a harmonic trap, so the particles move in a three-dimensional harmonic oscillator potential, with frequency ω_3 for oscillation in the 3 direction, and $\omega_\perp$ for oscillation in the 1–2 plane. Thus in general our model has rotational symmetry about the 3 axis only. Consider a single particle in this potential. The general form of an orbit is an ellipse centered at the center of the trap. However, we wish to focus on the single-particle states referred to in the quantum case as the LLL. These are the states of lowest kinetic energy for each positive value of the angular momentum about the 3 axis. The corresponding classical orbits are circles in the 1–2 plane, circling the 3 axis in the positive direction. For such an orbit, the momentum when the particle is at $\mathbf{r} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is clearly $\mathbf{p} = M\omega_\perp \hat{\mathbf{n}}_3 \times \mathbf{r}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_3$ is a unit vector in the 3 direction, and the angular momentum is $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p} = M\omega_\perp |\mathbf{r}|^2 \hat{\mathbf{n}}_3$. If the trap potential is removed at time $t = 0$, at which $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_0$, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_0$, the particle travels freely in a straight line. At time t it will be at $\mathbf{r}_0 + \mathbf{p}_0 t/M = \mathbf{r}_0 + \omega_\perp t\, \hat{\mathbf{n}}_3 \times \mathbf{r}_0 \simeq \omega_\perp t\, \hat{\mathbf{n}}_3 \times \mathbf{r}_0$ for large t. Hence if we have a collection of particles all moving on such orbits, their distribution in the 1–2 plane a long time $t \gg 1/\omega_\perp$ after removing the trap potential will be the same as it was at $t = 0$, except for a rescaling by $\omega_\perp t$, and a rotation by $\pi/2$ about the 3 axis. In this argument we have neglected the interactions between the particles once the trap potential is turned off. We will return to this question after discussing the quantum case.

We now turn to the fully quantum-mechanical treatment, beginning again with a single particle. Suppose the state at time $t = 0$ is $\psi(\mathbf{r}, 0) = \psi_0(\mathbf{r})$. For the free motion, the solution is simple in momentum space. We define the Fourier representation of the state ψ by

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\, \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{k}, t) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \tag{1}$$

and similarly for ψ_0. Then the state at time t is

$$\psi(\mathbf{r},t) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\, \tilde{\psi}_0(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r} - i\hbar\mathbf{k}^2 t/(2M)}. \tag{2}$$

The normalized single-particle basis states for the LLL have wavefunctions

$$u_m(z,x_3) = \frac{z^m e^{-|z|^2/(2l_\perp^2) - x_3^2/(2l_3^2)}}{\pi^{3/4} l_\perp^{m+1} l_3^{1/2} \sqrt{m!}}. \tag{3}$$

Here $z = x_1 + ix_2$, the angular momentum quantum number $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, and $l_\perp = \sqrt{\hbar/M\omega_\perp}$, $l_3 = \sqrt{\hbar/M\omega_3}$. We note that these states have their maximum amplitude on the circles in the 1–2 plane of radius $|z| = l_\perp\sqrt{m}$, which is the same as that of the circular classical orbit with angular momentum $m\hbar$. To calculate the Fourier transforms, it is useful to introduce the generating function

$$h_0(z,x_3) = e^{\xi z/l_\perp - |z|^2/(2l_\perp^2) - x_3^2/(2l_3^2)}, \tag{4}$$

of which the mth derivative with respect to ξ is proportional to $u_m(z,x_3)$. The Fourier transform of h_0 is

$$(2\pi)^{3/2} l_\perp^2 l_3 e^{-ik\xi l_\perp - |k|^2 l_\perp^2/2 - k_3^2 l_3^2/2}, \tag{5}$$

where $k = k_1 + ik_2$. Using (2), at time t, the generating function evolves to

$$h(z,x_3,t) = \frac{e^{\xi z/[l_\perp(1+i\omega_\perp t)] - |z|^2/[2l_\perp^2(1+i\omega_\perp t)] - x_3^2/[2l_3^2(1+i\omega_3 t)]}}{(1+i\omega_\perp t)(1+i\omega_3 t)^{1/2}}. \tag{6}$$

It follows that if a general normalized LLL initial state is written as $\psi_0(z,x_3) = f(z)e^{-|z|^2/(2l_\perp^2) - x_3^2/(2l_3^2)}$, where $f(z)$ is complex analytic in z (for example, f can be a polynomial), then at time t it becomes

$$\psi(z,x_3,t) = \frac{f(\frac{z}{1+i\omega_\perp t}) e^{-|z|^2/[2l_\perp^2(1+i\omega_\perp t)] - x_3^2/[2l_3^2(1+i\omega_3 t)]}}{(1+i\omega_\perp t)(1+i\omega_3 t)^{1/2}}. \tag{7}$$

The probability density is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(z,x_3,t)|^2 &= \frac{|f(\frac{z}{1+i\omega_\perp t})|^2 e^{-|z|^2/[l_\perp^2(1+\omega_\perp^2 t^2)] - x_3^2/[l_3^2(1+\omega_3^2 t^2)]}}{|1+i\omega_\perp t)(1+i\omega_3 t)^{1/2}|^2} \\ &= \left| \frac{\psi_0(\frac{z}{1+i\omega_\perp t}, \frac{x_3}{\sqrt{1+\omega_3^2 t^2}})}{(1+i\omega_\perp t)(1+i\omega_3 t)^{1/2}} \right|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This is simply the initial probability density $|\psi_0|^2$, with a rescaling and a rotation in the 1–2 coordinates, and x_3 also rescaled. Notice that the factor $1 + i\omega_\perp t$ describes the same rescaling and rotation of the initial complex position $z_0 = z/(1+i\omega_\perp t)$ in the 1–2 plane as the Cartesian formula $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_0 + \omega_\perp t\, \hat{\mathbf{n}}_3 \times \mathbf{r}_0$ that appeared in the classical argument. We should point out that our result is a special limiting case of expressions obtained by other methods [10,12], on ignoring interactions and restricting to the LLL, and is implicit in [7].

For large t ($t \gg 1/\omega_\perp$, $1/\omega_3$), we will be interested in $\mathbf{r}$ of order t, so define $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{r}/t$. As $t \to \infty$ with $\mathbf{V}$ fixed, $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$ itself is asymptotic to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{f(\frac{z}{i\omega_\perp t})}{i\omega_\perp t(i\omega_3 t)^{1/2}} e^{-|z|^2[(i\omega_\perp t)^{-1} + (\omega_\perp t)^{-2}]/(2l_\perp^2)} \\ &\quad \times e^{-x_3^2[(i\omega_3 t)^{-1} + (\omega_3 t)^{-2}]/(2l_3^2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In this limit, the probability density (8) becomes

$$\frac{\left|\psi_0\left(\frac{-iz}{\omega_\perp t}, \frac{x_3}{\omega_3 t}\right)\right|^2}{(\omega_\perp t)^2(\omega_3 t)}. \tag{10}$$

The transformations have simplified to a rescaling by $\omega_\perp t$ and a rotation by $\pi/2$ in the 1–2 plane, and a rescaling by $\omega_3 t$ in the 3 coordinate.

The long-time result can also be obtained by an application of the stationary phase approximation to eq. (2), which gives the limit $t \to \infty$ with $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{r}/t$ fixed, which for a general state ψ_0 is

$$\psi(\mathbf{r},t) \sim \tilde{\psi}_0\left(\frac{M\mathbf{r}}{\hbar t}\right) e^{iM\mathbf{r}^2/(2\hbar t) - 3\pi i/4} \left(\frac{M}{2\pi\hbar t}\right)^{3/2}, \tag{11}$$

and for the probability density

$$|\psi(\mathbf{r},t)|^2 \sim \left|\tilde{\psi}_0\left(\frac{M\mathbf{r}}{\hbar t}\right)\right|^2 \left(\frac{M}{2\pi\hbar t}\right)^3. \tag{12}$$

These well-known expressions mean that at long times, the distribution in position space is determined by the initial momentum distribution, as if the particle propagated classically with velocity $\mathbf{V} = \hbar\mathbf{k}/M$. This result is familiar in optics as the Fraunhofer limit of diffraction, for example in a two-slit experiment. In the LLL case, using eq. (5), the Fourier transform of the LLL initial state is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_0(\mathbf{k}) &= (2\pi)^{3/2} l_\perp^2 l_3 f(-ikl_\perp^2) e^{-|k|^2 l_\perp^2/2 - k_3^2 l_3^2/2} \\ &= (2\pi)^{3/2} l_\perp^2 l_3\, \psi_0(-ikl_\perp^2, k_3 l_3^2). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This shows that for the LLL, the probability density in $\mathbf{k}$ space is the same as that in position space, rescaled and rotated by $\pi/2$. This corresponds both to the classical argument above, and to the fact that in the LLL, the 1–2 coordinates are canonically conjugate, so $x_1 = p_2 l_\perp^2/\hbar$, $x_2 = -p_1 l_\perp^2/\hbar$. Using this in the stationary phase formula, we recover eq. (10).

Both the exact and approximate treatments generalize trivially to the case of N non-interacting particles with an initial state $\psi_0(\mathbf{r}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{r}_N)$, when it is a linear combination of products of LLL single-particle states. This gives the joint probability density for all N particles after the free expansion. This result also holds when the initial state is described by a density matrix within the LLL, such as a state of thermal equilibrium, but we will not consider that in detail here.

As a first example, consider a Bose condensate within the LLL. Its wavefunction at time $t = 0$ is a product,

$$\prod_{j=1}^{N} \psi_0(z_j, x_{3j}) \tag{14}$$

for some function ψ_0. In the LLL, if f in ψ_0 is a polynomial, one can always factorize $\psi_0(z, x_3) \propto \prod_a (z - w_a) e^{-|z|^2/(2l_\perp^2) - x_3^2/(2l_3^2)}$, and then we have N_v vortices at complex positions w_a, $a = 1, \ldots, N_v$. After a long free expansion, the wavefunction has the same product form, with the bosons condensed in

$$\prod_a [z - i(\omega_\perp t) w_a] e^{-|z|^2[(i\omega_\perp t)^{-1} + (\omega_\perp t)^{-2}]/(2l_\perp^2)} \times e^{-x_3^2[(i\omega_3 t)^{-1} + (\omega_3 t)^{-2}]/(2l_3^2)}. \tag{15}$$

Thus the vortices will be clearly visible in an image of the density in position space, provided the number of particles per vortex is large (see the discussion of such images below). This is the condition of large filling factor [5], which is the regime in which a condensed ground state of the type (14) occurs [5,8].

As a second example, we consider the Laughlin state [14], $\prod_{r<s} (z_r - z_s)^2 \cdot \prod_r e^{-|z_r|^2/(2l_\perp^2) - x_{3r}^2/(2l_3^2)}$, where r, $s = 1, \ldots, N$. The probability density after a long time t is the same as at $t = 0$, up to the usual two rescalings (the rotation can be ignored since the Laughlin state is rotationally invariant). This implies that all the spatial correlations are preserved after free expansion for time t.

In our treatment we have completely neglected interactions during the expansion. As justification for this, we note that, when the trap potential is present, the LLL approximation should be valid when the s-wave scattering length a and typical number density $\bar{n}$ in the bulk of the fluid satisfy $4\pi\hbar^2 a\bar{n}/M < 2\hbar\omega_\perp$, $\hbar\omega_3$. This condition ensures that corrections due to quantum-mechanical mixing of non-LLL states into the ground state can be neglected. Because $\bar{n}$ is reduced by centrifugal effects as the rotation rate increases, this condition is more likely to be satisfied at larger values of the total angular momenta than at small. (For quantum Hall states, the filling factor $\nu = \pi^{3/2} l_\perp^2 l_3 \bar{n}$ must be of order around 10 or less [5,8].) Even though the interactions are weak compared with the kinetic energies in the trap (which are typically many times $\hbar\omega_\perp$), the ground states may be highly correlated. That is because, if interactions are neglected, there are many degenerate states of the same total angular momentum [1]. (Classically, the particles in the "LLL" orbits keep the same relative positions, up to a rotation, as they move, and so the interactions are resonant—over a long time they can have a large effect.) The interaction energy scale is $4\pi\hbar^2 a\bar{n}/M$, and when the trap potential is removed, $\bar{n}$ decreases in the same way as the probability density, eq. (8). Hence the interaction strength goes to zero after a time of order $\max(1/\omega_\perp, 1/\omega_3)$, and the correction to the wavefunction, $\delta\psi/\psi$, due to the interaction term a long time after switch-off is small compared with 1 if $4\pi\hbar^2 a\bar{n}/M \max(1/\omega_\perp, 1/\omega_3) < \hbar$. This condition is essentially the same as that for the LLL approximation. Further, if the interactions are enhanced by the use of a Feshbach resonance (but still weak enough to use the LLL approx), then they can be greatly reduced at the same time that the trap is turned off, improving the accuracy of our neglect of interactions during the expansion.

Finally, now that we have shown how the free expansion of a LLL state acts as a wavefunction microscope, we point out that even a single high-resolution snapshot taken after a free expansion of a highly-correlated state contains a lot of information that can be used as a diagnostic tool for the many-body physics. Such a snapshot in principle gives a single typical configuration of all the particle positions. In view of the preceding discussion, we can discuss this in terms of the configuration at $t = 0$, which is drawn from the joint probability density $|\psi_0(z_1, \ldots, z_N)|^2$ [we will assume the coordinates are projected to the 1–2 plane, so we drop x_3 and work in two dimensions (2D) from here on]. In a highly correlated, incompressible state such as Laughlin's, long-wavelength density fluctuations are suppressed, and this can be seen even in a single snapshot, if the particle number is large compared with 1. For example, such a snapshot is shown in Ref. [15]. It differs markedly from a random configuration. The correlations can be quantified by constructing the two-particle correlation function of the snapshot. This is just a histogram of the values of $\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$ for all pairs of particles i, j (it will be automatically invariant under $\mathbf{r} \to -\mathbf{r}$). This can be compared with the two-particle quantum- (and thermal-) average correlation function $g(r) = \langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(z) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(z') \hat{\psi}(z') \hat{\psi}(z) \rangle / \bar{n}^2$ ($\hat{\psi}(z)$ is the 2D field operator, and $r = |z - z'|$) which has been calculated (usually in an edgeless geometry) for various incompressible fluid ground states. We note that in the thermodynamic limit, $g(r)$ is normalized so that it approaches 1 as $r \to \infty$. The wavefunction has an ergodicity property that ensures that even a correlation function constructed from a single sample (snapshot) reproduces the quantum/thermal-average $g(r)$, provided the particle number is large. Further, the Fourier transform of $\bar{n} g(\mathbf{r})$ is essentially the static (i.e. instantaneous) structure factor $s(\mathbf{q})$ [16].

There are two basic results that can be extracted from the density or its correlations $g(r)$ measured for a single snapshot. First, if one examines a subregion (say, a square) of area A of the fluid and determines the particle number $N_s \le N$ in this region, this number will fluctuate as the subregion is moved over a given snapshot, and also from one snapshot to another. If the side of the square subregion is larger than the length ξ we define below, but small enough that the mean $\overline{N_s}$ is $\ll N$, then in an equilibrium state the fluctuations ΔN_s will be of order $(\Delta N_s)^2 = k_B T A\, d\bar{n}/d\mu$, and give an estimate of the thermodynamic compressibility $d\bar{n}/d\mu$ (μ is the chemical potential), if the temperature T is known. Alternatively, in the thermodynamic limit one has $\lim_{\mathbf{q}\to 0} s(\mathbf{q}) = (k_B T/\bar{n}) d\bar{n}/d\mu$ [17]. In the zero-temperature limit, $d\bar{n}/d\mu$ goes to a finite (either zero or nonzero) value (except in the case of exactly-zero interactions in a Bose gas!), so these fluctuations vanish. For a translationally-invariant fluid in the LLL in the thermodynamic limit, there is a LLL-projected version $\bar{s}(\mathbf{q})$ of $s(\mathbf{q})$, which is easily obtained from the latter [16]. At $T = 0$, $\bar{s}(\mathbf{q})$ vanishes faster than $\mathbf{q}^2$ as $\mathbf{q} \to 0$, and for incompressible fluids (those in which $\lim_{T\to 0} d\bar{n}/d\mu = 0$) it goes as $\mathbf{q}^4$ [16]. The latter behavior is analytic, implying that $g(r) - 1$ tends to zero rapidly at large r. At a finite temperature, there will be a correlation length ξ, which diverges as $T \to 0$, and which is defined by the property that $s(\mathbf{q})$ will cross over at $q \sim \xi^{-1}$ from the $T > 0$ behavior at $\mathbf{q} \to 0$ to the $T = 0$ behavior at larger $\mathbf{q}$. Note that in an incompressible fluid such as Laughlin's, ξ diverges as $\xi \sim e^{\Delta E/(4k_B T)}$ as $T \to 0$, where ΔE is the quasiparticle-hole excitation energy or "gap". The behavior at $q > \xi^{-1}$ is the second property to look for using snapshots. Thus from these correlation properties, it is possible in principle to distinguish an incompressible quantum fluid from a thermally-melted vortex lattice.

In practice, there will be both a resolution function convoluted with the particle positions, and the question of the accuracy with which the density is measured at any point (noise). However, our proposal utilizes long-distance correlations where the spatial resolution should not be a problem, while the average over positions in a single snapshot alleviates the accuracy problem, and reduces the noise, which is presumably uncorrelated.

We would like to contrast our remarks with a proposal of Sinova *et al.* to measure the condensate fraction from the density profile [9]. They point out that, because of analyticity properties in the LLL, the diagonal density matrix (i.e. the quantum expectation $\langle n(\mathbf{r})\rangle$ of the single-particle density) determines the off-diagonal density matrix from which the condensate fraction can be defined. Their formula in our notation is

$$\beta = \frac{l_\perp^2}{4\pi N^2} \int d^2q\, |n(\mathbf{q})|^2 e^{|\mathbf{q}|^2 l_\perp^2/4}, \tag{16}$$

where $n(\mathbf{q})$ is the Fourier transform of $\langle n(\mathbf{r})\rangle$. The normalization is such that the maximum possible value of β is $\beta = 1$, and is attained in a product state, as in eq. (14). With the help of examples [9], it becomes clear that when the number of vortices N_v, say in a vortex lattice state, is large, the integral is dominated by large $\mathbf{q}$ values (up to $|\mathbf{q}|$ around $\sqrt{N_v}$), which tend to be suppressed by multiplication by the Fourier transform of the spatial resolution function. Further, even in a snapshot with perfect resolution, the particle density would be a sum of δ-functions at the particle positions, and would differ from the average density $\langle n(\mathbf{r})\rangle$ because of the presence of quantum (and more generally thermal) fluctuations. These fluctuations are larger relative to the mean, $\langle n(\mathbf{r})\rangle$, at small values of ν, which is precisely the regime of greatest interest. They also remain large at large $\mathbf{q}$ ($s(\mathbf{q}) \to 1$ [16]), whereas $n(\mathbf{q}) \to 0$ [9], and (as for any noise in the determination of the density at $\mathbf{r}$) they are enhanced in the integral by the factor $e^{|\mathbf{q}|^2 l_\perp^2/4}$. These fluctuations cannot be removed by averaging over space without destroying the large $\mathbf{q}$ information that is needed. It will be necessary to average over many snapshots to obtain the quantum average $\langle n(\mathbf{r})\rangle$.

While we were completing this paper, a discussion with some overlap with the second part of ours appeared [18].

We thank I. Bloch, E.A. Cornell, M. Holland, J. Sinova, and especially S.M. Girvin for useful discussions. We thank the organizers and participants of the workshop on "Correlation Effects in Bose Condensates and Optical Lattices" at the William I. Fine Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, for a stimulating environment in which this work was done. We acknowledge support from NSF grant no. DMR-02-42949 (NR) and EPSRC grant no. GR/R99027/01 (NRC).

---

[1] N.K. Wilkin, J.M.F. Gunn and R.A. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2265 (1998).

[2] D.A. Butts and D.S. Rokhsar, Nature **397**, 327 (1999); T.-L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 060403 (2001).

[3] B. Mottelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2695 (1999); G.F. Bertsch and T. Papenbrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5412 (1999); A.D. Jackson, G.M. Kavoulakis, B. Mottelson, and S.M. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 945 (2001); M.S. Hussein and O.K. Vorov, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 035603 (2002).

[4] N.K. Wilkin and J.M.F. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 6 (2000); N.R. Cooper and N.K. Wilkin, Phys. Rev. B **60**, R16279 (1999).

[5] N.R. Cooper, N.K. Wilkin and J.M.F. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 120405 (2001).

[6] S. Viefers, T.H. Hansson and S.M. Reimann, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 053604 (2000); B. Paredes, P. Fedichev, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 010402 (2001); J.W. Reijnders, F.J.M. van Lankvelt, K. Schoutens, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 120401 (2002); B. Paredes, P. Zoller, and J.I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 033609 (2002).

[7] T.-L. Ho and E.J. Mueller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 050401 (2002).

[8] J. Sinova, C.B. Hanna, and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 030403 (2002).

[9] J. Sinova, C.B. Hanna, and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 120401 (2003).

[10] Y. Kagan, E.L. Surkov, and G.V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R1753 (1996).

[11] Y. Castin and R. Dum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5315 (1996).

[12] Y. Castin and R. Dum, Eur. Phys. J. D **7**, 399 (1999).

[13] F. Dalfovo and M. Modugno, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 023605 (2000).

[14] R.B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).

[15] R.B. Laughlin, Ch. 7 in *The Quantum Hall Effect*, edited by R.E. Prange and S.M. Girvin (Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990), Fig. 7.7, p. 259.

[16] S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald and P. Platzman, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 2481 (1986).

[17] D. Forster, *Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, and Correlation Functions*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1990), p. 27.

[18] E. Altman, E. Demler, and M.D. Lukin, cond-mat/0306226.